

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 22-35 are pending. Claims 3, 4, 21, 24, 31 and 34 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 22, 23, 25-30, 32, 33 and 35 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 25 and 35 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that in claims 25 and 35, "a ring" lacks antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that since this term appears for the first time in each of these claims, the use of "a ring" is proper. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 26, 27, and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Schnepf-Pesch et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended to claim that the thrombectomy wire has at least one lumen extending for at least a portion thereof, wherein at least a portion of the deployable wire is located within the at least one lumen. Moreover, claim 26 already claims the thrombectomy wire having an aperture disposed in a distal region of the thrombectomy wire spaced apart from the distal end, and a lumen extending through the thrombectomy wire from the proximal end to the aperture, wherein at least one deployable wire is disposed within the lumen so that a distal region of the deployable wire exits through the aperture.

Applicants have carefully reviewed Schnepf-Pesch et al. and submit that the above claimed features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Schnepf-Pesch et al. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 22, 23, 25-29, 32, 33, and 35 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Jenkins et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above claim limitations in claims 1 and 26 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Jenkins et al. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Jenkins shows a thrombectomy wire 24 and at least one deployable wire 12 that is capable of being substantially flush with the thrombectomy wire when the deployable wire 12 will be straightened out on the same plane with the thrombectomy wire 24. Thus, it is the Examiner's position that stylet 24 is a thrombectomy wire. Looking at Figures 1 and 2 of Jenkins et

al., it is clearly seen that stylet 24 is solid. Thus, even taking stylet 24 as a thrombectomy wire, clearly stylet 24 does not disclose a thrombectomy wire having at least one lumen extending for at least a portion thereof. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicants respectfully submit that this rejection should be withdrawn.

As all of the outstanding rejections have been addressed and overcome, applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance directed toward claims 1, 2, 5-9, 22, 23, 25-30, 32, 33, and 35.

Should the Office have any questions, the Office is invited to telephone applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin J. Boland, 36,090
W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc.
551 Paper Mill Road
P.O. Box 9206
Newark, DE 19714-9206
(302) 738-4880

Date: April 11, 2005